IPMU 14-0127
ICRR-Report-683-2014-9

A solution to the baryon-DM coincidence problem in the CMSSM with a 126-GeV Higgs boson

Ayuki Kamada,[1,2] Masahiro Kawasaki,[1,3] and Masaki Yamada[1,3]

[1]*Kavli IPMU (WPI), TODIAS, University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, 277-8583, Japan*
[2]*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California, Riverside, CA, 92507, USA*
[3]*ICRR, University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, 277-8582, Japan*

(Dated: May 27, 2014)

We show that the baryon-dark matter coincidence problem is solved in the CMSSM. The baryons and dark matter are generated simultaneously through the late-time decay of non-topological solitons, Q-balls, which are formed after the Affleck-Dine baryogenesis. A certain relation between the universal scalar mass, m_0, and the universal gaugino mass, $M_{1/2}$, is required to solve the coincidence problem, marginally depending on the other CMSSM parameters, and the result is consistent with the observation of the 126-GeV Higgs boson.

PACS numbers: 98.80.Cq, 95.35.+d, 12.60.Jv

arXiv:1405.6577v1 [hep-ph] 26 May 2014

Introduction. The origins of the baryon asymmetry and dark matter (DM) are mysteries with which particle physics and cosmology are confronted. The precision measurement of the fluctuation of the cosmic background radiation shows a coincidence between the relic density of baryon and DM: $\Omega_{\rm DM}/\Omega_b \simeq 5$ [1, 2], referred to as the baryon-DM coincidence problem. This coincidence implies that baryon and DM are generated from the same origin. These observations require new physics beyond the Standard Model and give us useful information to close in on the true model of particle physics.

Low-energy supersymmetric (SUSY) models are well-motivated in particle physics in light of a gauge coupling unification and a solution of hierarchy problem between the electroweak scale and the Planck scale. The discovery of the 126-GeV Higgs boson by the LHC experiment [3, 4] and theoretical 3-loop calculations of Higgs mass implies that the masses of SUSY particles are $O(1)$ TeV [5, 6]. In SUSY theories, the lightest SUSY particle (LSP) is a good candidate for DM, and the baryon asymmetry can be generated by the Affleck-Dine baryogenesis [7, 8].

Based on a variant of the Affleck-Dine baryogenesis, a scenario for co-genesis of baryon and DM has been proposed by Enqvist and McDonald to overcome the baryon-DM coincidence problem in models of gravity mediation [9]. The baryon asymmetry is generated as a form of squark condensation, which then fragments into long-lived non-topological solitons, referred to as Q-balls [10–15]. Eventually, each Q-ball releases its baryon charge from its surface (evaporation) through baryon-number-conserving elementary processes, such as the decay of squark into quark and gaugino [16]. Since the gaugino soon decays into the LSP DM, the baryon (quarks) and DM (LSPs) are generated simultaneously by the evapolation of Q-balls. Enqvist and McDonald focused on the process of squark decay into quark and gaugino, which implies that the number of quarks is the same as that of the LSP due to the R-parity conservation. To explain the baryon-DM coincidence problem, they concluded that the mass of DM has to be $O(1)$ GeV [9]. Since this is excluded by the collider experiments, alternative scenarios have been proposed in Refs. [17–23].

Recently, we have investigated the evapolation of Q-ball in detail and have found that the process of squark annihilation $\tilde{q}\tilde{q} \to qq$ is the dominant process for the evapolation of Q-balls [24]. This implies that the DM mass of $O(100)$ GeV is consistent with the observed DM abundance even when the annihilation of DM is ineffective [25]. In that work, we have considered a model of wino-LSP so that its thermal relic density can be neglected. In this letter, we apply the calculation to the CMSSM with a low reheating temperature, which dilutes the thermal relic density of bino-LSP. Our results clearly shows that the baryon-DM coincidence problem can be solved even in such a simple model without any additional fields and without any fine-tuned parameters. The CMSSM parameter space for co-genesis is unique from and complementary to the conventional bino thermal relic scenarios. In particular, co-genesis predicts lighter sfermions and heavier gauginos than conventional scenarios. The results are consistent with the observation of the 126-GeV Higgs boson and would be tested by future LHC experiments.

Origin of baryon asymmetry. Let us consider the dynamics of a F- and D-flat direction denoted by ϕ carrying nonzero baryon charge b. During inflation, the flat direction obtains Hubble-induced terms through the supergravity effect, and its potential is given as

$$V = m_\phi(\phi)^2|\phi|^2 + c_H H^2 |\phi|^2 + \frac{\lambda^2}{M_{\rm pl}^{2n-6}} |\phi|^{2(n-1)} + \left(\frac{-\lambda a_g}{n M_{\rm pl}^{n-3}} m_{3/2} \phi^n + \frac{-\lambda a_H}{n M_{\rm pl}^{n-3}} H \phi^n + {\rm h.c.} \right), \quad (1)$$

where H is the Hubble parameter, $M_{\rm pl}$ ($\simeq 2.4 \times 10^{18}$ GeV) is the Planck scale, and the parameters c_H, a_g, and a_H are $O(1)$ constants. Here we have included

higher dimensional terms coming from a superpotential $W = \lambda\phi^n/nM_{\rm pl}^{n-3}$. We write the soft mass of the flat direction as $m_\phi(\phi)$, implicitly taking into account the logarithmic dependence on ϕ due to quantum correction. The gravitino mass $m_{3/2}$ is the same order as m_ϕ in models of gravity mediation.

Hereafter, we assume $c_H < 0$, which makes the flat direction obtain a large vacuum expectation value (VEV) determined by the unknown parameters λ and n. The phase direction stays at a certain phase determined by $\mathrm{Im}[a_H]$. After inflation ends, the Hubble parameter decreases with time as $\propto a^{-3/2}$, where a is a scale factor. Once the Hubble parameter H decreases down to m_ϕ, the flat direction feels the soft mass term and starts to oscillate around the low energy vacuum. At the same time, the phase direction feels the soft A-term and is kicked into phase direction due to $\mathrm{Im}[a_H] \neq \mathrm{Im}[a_g]$. This rotation in the complex plane results in the generation of baryon asymmetry, which is given as

$$\left(\frac{a(t)}{a(t_{\rm osc})}\right)^3 n_B(t) = 2b\int a^3 \mathrm{Im}\left[\phi^*\frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi^*}\right]\mathrm{d}t \sim bm_{3/2}\left|\phi_{\rm osc}\right|^2. \quad (2)$$

Without any entropy production other than the reheating of the Universe due to inflaton decay, the baryon-to-entropy ratio is given as

$$Y_B \equiv \frac{n_B}{s} = \frac{3T_{\rm RH}}{4}\left.\frac{n_B}{\rho_{\rm inf}}\right|_{\rm osc} \sim \frac{bm_{3/2}T_{\rm RH}}{4m_\phi^2}\left(\frac{|\phi_{\rm osc}|}{M_{\rm pl}}\right)^2, \quad (3)$$

where $\rho_{\rm inf}$ is the energy density of inflaton. Note that the uncertainty in the last equality can be compensated by the choice of the reheating temperature $T_{\rm RH}$, to which our final predictions are insensitive as shown below.

Since the usual thermal relic density of the bino-LSP is over-abundant without help of slepton/stop co-annihilation or large higgsino mixing, co-genesis can be realized only with a reheating temperature lower than the LSP freeze-out temperature to dilute the thermal relic density of the LSP. Note that the abundance of DM produced through the reheating process is negligible for a sufficiently low reheating temperature $T_{\rm RH} \lesssim 100$ MeV and a sufficiently large inflaton mass [26], though these condition have $O(1)$ uncertainty. Such a low reheating temperature is also favoured in light of baryonic isocurvature constraints [27–31]. Hereafter, we take the reheating temperature as a free parameter less than $O(1)$ GeV. Once we determine the reheating temperature, the observed baryon-to-entropy ratio ($Y_B = 8.7 \times 10^{-11}$ [32]) determines the VEV of the flat direction $\phi_{\rm osc}$ through Eq. (3).

Q-ball. The amplitude of the flat direction soon decreases due to the Hubble expansion after starting the oscillation. The dynamics of the flat direction is then determined by the soft mass term as

$$V = m_\phi^2(\phi)\left|\phi\right|^2 = m_\phi^2|\phi|^2\left(1 + K\log\frac{|\phi|^2}{M_{\rm pl}^2}\right), \quad (4)$$

where we explicitly write the running feature of the mass of the flat direction. In most cases we are interested in, the gauge interaction dominantly induces a negative K, as shown below. The negative K leads to an instability of the homogeneous solution of the squark condensation and results in the formation of non-topological solitons called Q-balls, which are localized lumps of squark condensation carrying large baryon charges [9–15].

The first stage of Q-ball formation can be investigated by the linear analysis [9]. Small fluctuations over a homogeneous background are unstable and grows exponentially at wave number $k < k_{\rm max} \simeq 2\left|K\right|^{1/2} m_\phi$. In particular, the mode of $\left|K\right|^{1/2} m_\phi$ grows most efficiently and Q-balls with a size of $R \simeq 1/\left|K\right|^{1/2} m_\phi$ are formed. A typical charge (= baryon number) of Q-balls is thus estimated as $Q \sim R^3 n_B(t_{\rm form})$, where $t_{\rm form}$ is the time of Q-ball formation. In fact, numerical simulations of Q-ball formation imply that it is given as

$$Q = \beta b\left(\frac{\phi_{\rm osc}}{m_\phi}\right)^2, \quad (5)$$

where $\beta \simeq 0.02$ [14, 33].

The configuration and properties of Q-ball are obtained by deriving the configuration which minimizes the energy with a finite baryon charge. In the case of potential of Eq. (4), the configuration of the Q-ball is approximately gaussian [9]:

$$\phi(r,t) \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\phi_0 e^{-r^2/2R^2} e^{-i\omega_0 t}, \quad (6)$$

where R, ω_0, and ϕ_0 are given as

$$R \simeq \frac{1}{|K|^{1/2} m_\phi(\phi_0)}, \quad (7)$$

$$\omega_0 \simeq m_\phi(\phi_0), \quad (8)$$

$$\phi_0 \simeq \left(\frac{|K|}{\pi}\right)^{3/4} m_\phi(\phi_0) Q^{1/2}. \quad (9)$$

The energy of the Q-ball per unit charge is approximately equal to ω_0.

Q-ball decay. Since Q-balls consist of squarks, each Q-ball gradually releases its baryon charge through the processes like $\tilde{q} \to q + \tilde{g}$ and $\tilde{q}\tilde{q} \to qq$, where $\tilde{q}$, q, and $\tilde{g}$ represent a squark, quark, and gaugino (or higgsino), respectively [16, 24]. These reaction rates are so large that quark, gaugino, and higgsino production rates from Q-ball decay are saturated by the upper bound due to the Pauli blocking effect at the Q-ball surface [16, 24].

Since particles interacting with a Q-ball in tree level obtain the effective mass of $g_i\phi(r)$ inside the Q-ball,

where g_i generically represents a coupling constant, they are produced at the surface of the Q-ball with the effective radius $\tilde{R}_i$ determined by the condition $g_i\phi(\tilde{R}) = \omega_0$. This implies that the Q-ball decay rate is given as

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}Q}{\mathrm{d}t} \simeq \sum_i b_i 4\pi \tilde{R}_i^2 \boldsymbol{n}\cdot\boldsymbol{j_i}, \tag{10}$$

where $\boldsymbol{n}$ is a pointing normal for the Q-ball surface and $\boldsymbol{j_i}$ is flux of each particle (baryon number b_i) interacting with the Q-ball. Q-balls completely evaporate at the time of $H \simeq Q^{-1}\mathrm{d}Q/\mathrm{d}t$.

Let us consider the flux of quarks from Q-ball decay. They are mainly produced through the squark annihilation $\tilde{q}\tilde{q} \to qq$ and their flux determined by the Pauli blocking effect is given as

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{n}\cdot\boldsymbol{j_i} &\simeq 2\int \frac{\mathrm{d}^3k}{(2\pi)^3}\theta\left(\omega_0 - |\boldsymbol{k}|\right)\theta\left(\boldsymbol{k}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\right)\hat{\boldsymbol{k}}\cdot\boldsymbol{n} \\ &= \frac{\omega_0}{12\pi^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

We can estimate the number of quarks (n_q) interacting with the Q-ball to take the summation in Eq. (10) for a given flat direction. In general, there is an upper bound on n_q: 3 (color) $\times$ 6 (family) $\times$ 2 (chirality) = 36. The estimation of n_q allows us to approximate the Q-ball decay rate such as $n_q/3 \times 4\pi\tilde{R}\omega_0/12\pi^2$, where $\tilde{R} \simeq (\log[\phi_0/\omega_0])^{1/2}R$.

Gauginos and/or higgsinos are produced from Q-ball through the squark decay ($\tilde{q} \to q + \tilde{g}$). In this case, we have to take into account the masses of SUSY particles. When a gaugino with a mass of m_χ obtains an energy E_χ, which is within the interval of $[m_\chi, \omega_0]$, the relevant quark obtains the energy of $\omega_0 - E_\chi$. Their phase space integrals are then proportional to $\int \mathrm{d}E_\chi p_i^2$, where p_i represents the momentum of each particle. Since the flux is determined by the smaller phase space due to the Pauli exclusion principle, it is given as

$$\boldsymbol{n}\cdot\boldsymbol{j_\chi} \simeq \frac{1}{8\pi^2}\int_{m_\chi}^{\omega_0} \mathrm{d}E_\chi \min\left[(\omega_0 - E_\chi)^2, E_\chi^2 - m_\chi^2\right], \tag{12}$$

$$= \frac{\omega_0^3}{96\pi^2} \times f(m_\chi/\omega_0), \tag{13}$$

$$f(x) \equiv \begin{cases} 1 - 6x^2 + 8x^3 - 3x^4 & \text{for } 0 \le x \le 1, \\ 0 & \text{for } 1 < x, \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

where we define a function $f(x)$ so that it can be applied to the case of $m_\chi \geq \omega_0$.

The scenario for co-genesis. Using Eqs. (11) and (13), we obtain the baryon-to-DM ratio from Q-ball decay such as

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\Omega_{\rm DM}}{\Omega_B} &\simeq \frac{3m_{\rm LSP}}{m_p}\frac{\mathrm{Br(Q\text{-}ball \to sparticles)}}{\mathrm{Br(Q\text{-}ball \to quarks)}} \\ &\simeq \frac{3m_{\rm LSP}}{m_p}\frac{\sum_s g_s f(m_{\rm s}/\omega_0)}{8n_q},\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $m_{\rm LSP}$ and m_p are the LSP mass and the proton mass, respectively, and the summation is taken for gauginos and higgsinos which interact with the Q-ball. The number of degrees of freedom g_s is 1 for the bino, 3 for the wino, 8 for the gluino, and 4 for the higgsino. We should emphasize that the resulting baryon-to-DM ratio Eq. (15) depends only on the masses of SUSY particles except for n_q, which is typically $O(10)$. Thus, we can calculate the baryon-to-DM ratio from Eq. (15) once we specify the SUSY model without any additional assumptions.

Here let us check whether the annihilation of the LSP is efficient or not, which might affect the baryon-to-DM ratio of Eq. (15). One might wonder that the spatial distribution of LSPs are localized around the Q-balls. However, the spatial distribution of LSPs becomes homogeneous due to their free streaming before its thermalization and annihilation become effective [9, 22]. The annihilation effect is ineffective when $n_{\rm DM}\langle\sigma v\rangle \lesssim H$ is satisfied at the time of Q-ball decay. In that case, the baryon-to-DM ratio given by Eq. (15) is justified. We estimate the annihilation cross section $\langle\sigma v\rangle$ as follows.

First, we check whether the LSPs kinematically thermalized due to elastic interactions with the thermal plasma or not. Since the LSP is mostly bino, the elastic scattering through sfermion exchange is in charge of losing their energy. The energy-loss rate is given as

$$\begin{aligned}-\frac{\mathrm{d}E_{\tilde{b}}}{E_{\tilde{b}}\mathrm{d}t} = \sum_i \frac{31\pi^3}{5120}g_1^4\frac{T^6}{m_{\tilde{b}}^6}E_{\tilde{b}}\left(1 - \frac{m_{\tilde{b}}^2}{E_{\tilde{b}}^2}\right)\left(6\frac{E_{\tilde{b}}^2}{m_{\tilde{b}}^2} - 1\right) \\ \times\left\{\left(\frac{Y_L^2}{m_{\tilde{f}_L}^2/m_{\tilde{b}}^2 - 1}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{Y_R^2}{m_{\tilde{f}_R}/m_{\tilde{b}}^2 - 1}\right)^2\right\},\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

with $g_1 = \sqrt{5/3}g_Y$, left/right-handed sfermion masses $m_{\tilde{f}_{L/R}}$, $Y_L = -1/2, 1/6$ for leptons and quarks, and $Y_R = -1, 2/3, -1/3$ for charged leptons, up- and down-type quarks. The summation is taken for all relativistic particles. We average the energy-loss rate over non-thermal distribution, that is, we integrate it in terms of the energy of the bino $E_{\tilde{b}}$ with the weight given as the integrant of Eq. (12).

If the energy-loss is larger than the Hubble expansion rate, we use the thermally averaged annihilation cross section. Otherwise, we adopt the non-thermal annihilation cross section. The sfermion exchange dominates the annihilation of LSPs, whether the produced LSPs are thermalised or not. The annihilation cross sections are too lengthy to be presented here. For the thermally averaged annihilation cross section, we consider s- and p-wave contributions [34]. When we calculate the non-thermal annihilation cross section, we ignore the fermion masses and average it over non-thermal distribution. We also take into account enhancement of annihilation cross section due to resonance effects though we find it subdominant.

Application to the CMSSM. Here we apply the above scenario in the CMSSM, where all MSSM parameters are determined by the universal scalar mass, m_0, the universal gaugino mass, $M_{1/2}$, the universal trilinear scalar coupling, A_0, the ratio of the VEV of the two Higgs fields, $\tan\beta$, and the sign of the higgsino mass parameter, sign[μ]. We use the code `SOFTSUSY 3.3.6` to calculate the spectrum of SUSY particles [35]. We estimate the parameters K and $m_\phi(\phi_0)$ as averages of beta functions and masses over all squarks at the energy scale of ϕ_0, respectively.

Figure 1 shows that the observed baryon-to-DM ratio is realized in the blue shaded region and it requires $m_0 \sim M_{1/2}$. This is because the function f in Eq. (14) has to be suppressed for bino mass of $O(1)$ TeV, that is, $m_{\tilde{b}} \simeq \omega_0$ ($\simeq m_0$). The annihilation of the LSP is ineffective above the light green lines, which we assume $T_{\rm RH} \lesssim 0.1$ GeV. For larger reheating temperature, the annihilation of the LSP is more ineffective. One can see that the annihilation effect is irrelevant in most of the blue shaded regions and Eq. (15) is justified. Above the magenta dot-dashed line, $K < 0$ for all squarks, which means that Q-balls are always formed after the Affleck-Dine baryogenesis. In the light gray region, the averaged value of K is positive and Q-balls cannot be formed unless the flat direction consists mainly of first and second family squarks. The red curves are contours of Higgs mass calculated with the code `FeynHiggs 2.10.0` [36–40]. Note that there are uncertainties for the predicted Higgs mass coming mainly from the uncertainties for the top mass and higher loop corrections. The light green regions are excluded by the ATLAS search for $\not{E}_T$ events with 20 fb^{-1} of data at 8 TeV [6], which has been shown to be independent of $\tan\beta$ and A_0 [41].

We also use the code `micrOMEGAs 3.6.9` to calculate the spin-independent interactions of the LSP on nucleons [44]. We find that in the blue shaded regions the cross section is much less than 10^{-46} cm^2, which is out of reach of the XENON1T experiment [45]. This is a unique prediction of our co-genesis scenario from the conventional thermal relic scenario, where a sizable higgsino mixing usually leads to a detectable signal in the XENON1T in the bulk parameter region.

Conclusions. We have investigated a scenario for co-genesis of baryon and DM from Q-ball decay. Since the branchings into quarks and SUSY particles from Q-ball decay are related with each other with a simple relation due to the Pauli exclusion principle, the resulting baryon-to-DM ratio naturally results in $O(1)$. We have applied the calculation to the CMSSM and have identified a parameter region in which the baryon-to-DM ratio, their absolute abundance, and the Higgs mass are consistent with the observations. A part of the parameter region would be tested by future LHC experiments (see Fig. 1).

Acknowledgements This work is supported by Grant-



FIG. 1. Allowed contours consistent with observations in two $(m_0, M_{1/2})$ planes of the CMSSM, with $\tan\beta = 10$ and $A_0 = 0$ (upper panel) and $\tan\beta = 30$ and $A_0 = -2m_0$ (lower panel) with sign[μ] $= +1$. We can account for the baryon-to-DM ratio as well as baryon density in the blue shaded region, where we use $n_q \leq 36$. The red lines represent contours for the mass of the Higgs boson. The annihilation of the LSP is ineffective above the light green lines, which is plotted in the case of $T_{\rm RH} \lesssim 0.1$ GeV. Above the magenta dot-dashed line, $K < 0$ for all squarks. In the light gray region, the averaged value of K is positive. The dark gray shaded areas are excluded either because the LSP is charged, there is no consistent electroweak vacuum, or the mass of chargino is less than 100 GeV. The light green regions are excluded by the ATLAS search. The 14 TeV LHC with 100 fb^{-1} and 3000 fb^{-1} would probe the parameter space below the magenta and blue dotted line, respectively [5, 42, 43]. We assume that the top quark pole mass as $m_t^{\rm pole} = 173.3$ GeV.

in-Aid for Scientific research from the Ministry of Education, Science, Sports, and Culture (MEXT), Japan, No. 25400248 (M.K.), No. 21111006 (M.K.); the World Premier International Research Center Initiative (WPI Initiative), MEXT, Japan (A.K., M.K., and M.Y.); the Program for Leading Graduate Schools, MEXT, Japan (M.Y.); and JSPS Research Fellowships for Young Scientists (M.Y.).

[1] G. Hinshaw *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], Astrophys. J. Suppl. **208**, 19 (2013) [arXiv:1212.5226 [astro-ph.CO]].
[2] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1303.5076 [astro-ph.CO].
[3] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex]].
[4] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 30 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex]].
[5] J. L. Feng, P. Kant, S. Profumo and D. Sanford, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 131802 (2013) [arXiv:1306.2318 [hep-ph]].
[6] O. Buchmueller, M. J. Dolan, J. Ellis, T. Hahn, S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik, J. Marrouche and K. A. Olive *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **74**, 2809 (2014) [arXiv:1312.5233 [hep-ph]].
[7] I. Affleck and M. Dine, Nucl. Phys. B **249**, 361 (1985).
[8] M. Dine, L. Randall and S. D. Thomas, Nucl. Phys. B **458**, 291 (1996). [hep-ph/9507453].
[9] K. Enqvist and J. McDonald, Phys. Lett. B **425**, 309 (1998); Nucl. Phys. B **538**, 321 (1999).
[10] S. Coleman, Nucl. Phys. **B262** (1985) 263.
[11] A. Kusenko, Phys. Lett. **B405** (1997) 108.
[12] A. Kusenko and M. E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **418**, 46 (1998).
[13] S. Kasuya and M. Kawasaki, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 041301(R) (2000).
[14] S. Kasuya and M. Kawasaki, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 023512 (2000).
[15] S. Kasuya and M. Kawasaki, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 123515 (2001).
[16] A. G. Cohen, S. R. Coleman, H. Georgi and A. Manohar, Nucl. Phys. B **272**, 301 (1986).
[17] L. Roszkowski and O. Seto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 161304 (2007) [hep-ph/0608013].
[18] M. Fujii and K. Hamaguchi, Phys. Lett. B **525**, 143 (2002) [hep-ph/0110072].
[19] M. Fujii and K. Hamaguchi, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 083501 (2002) [hep-ph/0205044].
[20] I. M. Shoemaker and A. Kusenko, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 075021 (2009).
[21] S. Kasuya and M. Kawasaki, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 123528 (2011) [arXiv:1107.0403 [hep-ph]].
[22] F. Doddato and J. McDonald, JCAP **1307**, 004 (2013) [arXiv:1211.1892 [hep-ph]].
[23] S. Kasuya, M. Kawasaki and M. Yamada, Phys. Lett. B **726**, 1 (2013) [arXiv:1211.4743 [hep-ph]].
[24] M. Kawasaki and M. Yamada, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 023517 (2013) [arXiv:1209.5781 [hep-ph]].
[25] A. Kamada, M. Kawasaki and M. Yamada, Phys. Lett. B **719**, 9 (2013) [arXiv:1211.6813 [hep-ph]].
[26] K. Harigaya, M. Kawasaki, K. Mukaida and M. Yamada, arXiv:1402.2846 [hep-ph].
[27] K. Enqvist and J. McDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2510 (1999) [hep-ph/9811412].
[28] K. Enqvist and J. McDonald, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 043502 (2000) [hep-ph/9912478].
[29] M. Kawasaki and F. Takahashi, Phys. Lett. B **516**, 388 (2001) [hep-ph/0105134].
[30] S. Kasuya, M. Kawasaki and F. Takahashi, JCAP **0810**, 017 (2008) [arXiv:0805.4245 [hep-ph]].
[31] K. Harigaya, A. Kamada, M. Kawasaki, K. Mukaida and M. Yamada, arXiv:1404.3138 [hep-ph].
[32] J. Beringer *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **86**, 010001 (2012).
[33] T. Hiramatsu, M. Kawasaki and F. Takahashi, JCAP **1006**, 008 (2010) [arXiv:1003.1779 [hep-ph]].
[34] T. Falk, R. Madden, K. A. Olive and M. Srednicki, Phys. Lett. B **318**, 354 (1993) [hep-ph/9308324].
[35] B. C. Allanach, Comput. Phys. Commun. **143**, 305 (2002) [hep-ph/0104145].
[36] S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik and G. Weiglein, Comput. Phys. Commun. **124**, 76 (2000) [hep-ph/9812320].
[37] S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik and G. Weiglein, Eur. Phys. J. C **9**, 343 (1999) [hep-ph/9812472].
[38] G. Degrassi, S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik, P. Slavich and G. Weiglein, Eur. Phys. J. C **28**, 133 (2003) [hep-ph/0212020].
[39] M. Frank, T. Hahn, S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik, H. Rzehak and G. Weiglein, JHEP **0702**, 047 (2007) [hep-ph/0611326].
[40] T. Hahn, S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik, H. Rzehak and G. Weiglein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 141801 (2014) [arXiv:1312.4937 [hep-ph]].
[41] O. Buchmueller, R. Cavanaugh, M. Citron, A. De Roeck, M. J. Dolan, J. R. Ellis, H. Flacher and S. Heinemeyer *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **72**, 2243 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7315].
[42] H. Baer, V. Barger, A. Lessa and X. Tata, JHEP **0909**, 063 (2009) [arXiv:0907.1922 [hep-ph]].
[43] H. Baer, V. Barger, A. Lessa and X. Tata, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 117701 (2012) [arXiv:1207.4846 [hep-ph]].
[44] G. Belanger, F. Boudjema, A. Pukhov and A. Semenov, Comput. Phys. Commun. **185**, 960 (2014) [arXiv:1305.0237 [hep-ph]].
[45] E. Aprile [XENON1T Collaboration], arXiv:1206.6288 [astro-ph.IM].